[18th August 1956

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : It is not as if immediately a beggar was taken into custody he is sent to the Beggar Home. An enquiry is made and if the relations of that particular person are willing to take him back or if he himself says that he would go back to his home, then he is set free. It is not a question of his being taken automatically to the Care Home or Special Home.

SRI M. PALANIYANDI : பிச்சைக்காரர்களை எப்படியாவது பாது காப்பதற்காக ராஜாஜி முதன் மந்திரியாக இருந்த காலத்திலேயே மத்திய அரசாங்கத்துடன் கடிதப்போக்குவரத்து நடந்து வந்ததாகத் தெரியவருகிறது. இம்மாதிரி முக்கியமான சமூகப் பிரச்னைகளை மத்திய அரசாங்கம் தாமத மில்லாமல் சீக்கிரமாக தீர்ப்பதற்கு நமது நிதி அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் வேண்டிய நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பார்களா ?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I hope they are also aware of the urgency of the problem. It is not as if they were averse to giving sanction to these schemes; but I am hoping they would be giving some relief, even though that relief may not satisfy us to the extent we required.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : When persons who come to power forget the beggars, is it not good that those who go to the temples treat the beggars with kindness and pay them something for their relief?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : This is a matter of differing opinions. But I may assure the hon. Member that it is not those who are in power who forget the beggar problem. As a matter of fact, they have to think always how to tackle this baffling problem. But others have no responsibility other than pointing out the defects and saying that no steps have been taken to tackle this beggar problem.

Dispute between the management and workers of the Madurai Mills

* 124 *Q.*—SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any conciliation by the Labour Commissioner took place during May 1956 in the dispute between the management and workers of the Madurai Mills, Ltd., Madurai:

(*b*) when the Labour Commissioner submitted his report to the Government?

(*c*) when and what action was taken by the Government on the report; and

(*d*) whether a copy of the report will be placed on the table of the House?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (*a*) Yes, Sir.

18th August 1956]

(b) The Commissioner of Labour submitted his report on 15th May 1956.

(c) On 30th May 1956 the Government referred the following issues for adjudication by a Special Industrial Tribunal constituted for the purpose :

(i) Whether the revision of the workload as notified by the management would be necessary and justifiable; and if not, to what extent, modifications, if any, are necessary; and

(ii) what should be the revision in the existing basic wages?

The Government did not refer the other demands of the workers for adjudication by the Tribunal as they considered them to be not justified. The parties have been informed accordingly.

(d) A copy * of the Conciliation Report of the Commissioner of Labour, dated 15th May 1956, is placed on the table of the House.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : May I know from the Hon. Minister why Government have not referred the question of making permanent the large number of temporary workers for adjudication. In the report it is stated that there are thousands of temporary workers in this mill who had not been made permanent.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : From the report of the Commissioner of Labour, Government found that the management were already employing the required number of permanent workers. Temporary workers could be confirmed only when permanent vacancies arise. Therefore Government thought that no intervention was justified.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : Are the Government aware of the fact that when the Conciliation Officer asked the management on an earlier occasion to supply him with a list of permanent workers and temporary workers, the management consistently refused to supply that list for three months. In those circumstances may I know on what basis Government came to the conclusion that the management were employing the required number of permanent workers?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I have already said that Government came to this conclusion on the report and particulars furnished by the Commissioner of Labour.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : What is found in the report is that Sri Cunniah argued that 4,000 workers had been kept as temporary and he wanted that they should be made permanent. Neither the Commissioner of Labour nor the Hon. Minister is able to tell us how they came to know the total strength of permanent workers in the mill. I submit that these 4,000 workers have been treated as temporary workers for a considerable number of

* Printed as Appendix I on pages 840–844 infra.

years. If they are not permanently required, the management would not have kept them as temporary workers for such a long time. Will the Government see that this dispute is referred for adjudication because the management have been trying to evade the responsibility of conferring certain privileges on the workers by not making them permanent?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : What has been placed on the table of the House is only a copy of the conciliation report. But we have also got further reports from the Commissioner of Labour and according to the information furnished by the Commissioner of Labour, Government found that there were no permanent vacancies.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : When did the Commissioner of Labour make enquiries? When did he get these figures? What was the date on which he collected these figures? Was the Employees' Union given an opportunity to challenge these figures?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : For furnishing the particulars asked for by the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to have notice.

SRI M. PALANIYANDI : நிரந்தரமாக வேலை காலி உள்ளதா இல்லையா என்பது பற்றி கேள்வி அல்ல. சாதாரணமாக சுமார் 4,000 தொழிலாளர்கள் 150, 200 நாட்களுக்கு வேலை வாங்கப்படுகிறார்கள். ஆகையால் மானேஜ்மெண்ட், லேபர் கமிஷனர் முதலியோர்களைக்கொண்ட ஒரு சிறு கமிட்டி அமைத்து எவ்வளவு நாட்களுக்கு அவர்கள் வேலை செய்திருக்கிறார்கள், அவர்களை நிரந்தரமாக்குவதற்கு முடியுமா முடியாதா என்பதுபற்றி விசாரணை செய்ய அரசாங்கம் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்குமா ?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : உள்ளூரில் இருக்கும் லேபர் ஆபீசர், லேபர் கமிஷனர் இவர்களை என்னென்ன 'இஷ்யூக்கள்' எழுப்பப்பட்டதோ, அவைகளைப்பற்றி விசாரித்து ரிபோர்ட் அனுப்பச் சொன்னோம். அவர்கள் இந்த விஷயங்களில் அரசாங்கம் தலையிடுவதற்கு ஒன்றும் வழியில்லை என்று அபிப்பிராயம் தெரிவித்தார்கள். அந்த அபிப்பிராயத்தை அரசாங்கம் ஒப்புக்கொண்டு அதன்படி முடிவு செய்தது.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : What was the basis on which the Government of Madras came to the conclusion that there was no justification for the claim of bonus?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : After examining the report of the Commissioner of Labour, Government came to certain conclusions. The offer of the management to give four months basic wages as bonus for 1955 has been accepted without prejudice by all workers except those belonging to five unions numbering 9,217. Government are satisfied that the amount claimed as rehabilitation reserve by the management is correct according to the decision of the Labour Appellate Tribunal. After allowing for rehabilitation reserve, there was no surplus left other than that offered by the management. Therefore, Government considered there was no good case for adjudication.

9-00 a.m. SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : Are the Government aware that last year when the management put forward the same plea with regard

18th August 1956]

to the amount claimed towards rehabilitation allowance and the Government also accepted that plea, the Industrial Tribunal decided against the management and the Government. Are the Government to-day sitting in judgment over the decision of the Tribunal?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I have no information about the latest decisions of the Labour Appellate Tribunal.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : What is the latest decision of the Appellate Tribunal that he refers to? There was no decision of the Appellate Tribunal after the last year's decision. Are the Government sitting in judgment over the decision of the Labour Appellate Tribunal?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : There is no question of the Madras Government sitting in judgment over the decision of any Tribunal. On the basis of the decision of the Appellate Tribunal, the Government came to this conclusion.

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : மதுரை மில்லில் வேலை பளு அதிகரித்திருப்பதனால்தான் தாற்காலிகத் தொழிலாளர்களை நிரந்தரமாக்க முடியவில்லை என்று ரிப்போர்டில் சொல்லியிருக்கிறார்கள். வேலை பளுவை குறைப்பதற்கு சர்க்கார் ஏதாவது நடவடிக்கை எடுத்திருக்கிறார்களா?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : வேலைப் பளுவிஷயமாகத்தான் இப்போது பிரத்யேக (ஸ்பெஷல்) ட்ரிப்யூனல் அமைக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இது பற்றி இந்த ட்ரிப்யூனல் விசாரித்து முடிவு சொல்லும்.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : When the Government allow the management to increase the workload, why should they not compel the management to make the temporary workers permanent?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I am unable to understand what exactly the hon. Member suggests. The Government have referred to a Special Industrial Tribunal the revision of the workload.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : It is seen from the balance-sheet that last year, out of a total profit of Rs. 44·20 lakhs, the management has allotted Rs. 22·63 lakhs towards rehabilitation allowance. Last year the management claimed only Rs. 17 lakhs which had been disallowed by the Labour Appellate Tribunal. On what basis did the Government agree to the allotment of such a huge sum for rehabilitation purposes?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : If the hon. Member would put a separate question, I could explain the basis on which the Government came to this decision.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : What is the basis on which the Government of Madras came to the conclusion that these unions were not representative of the workers? Did the Government adopt the same criterion in Mettur last year. When the workers received bonus as per agreement with another Union, the Government thought it fit to refer the matter for adjudication.

[18th August 1956

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I may tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the Government do not discriminate between one union and another.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : If the Government do not discriminate, may I request the Hon. Minister to enlighten us as to the basis on which they allowed adjudication in the case of Mettur and denied adjudication in the case of Madurai?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : When I say that we do not discriminate between one union and another, I want the hon. Leader of the Opposition to understand that we put a different interpretation on the position in Mettur.

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : The Minister referred to the Government interfering with the interpretation of the Tribunal. May I know whether the interpretation was given by a judicial tribunal or a quasi-judicial tribunal?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The hon. Member is quite well aware of the constitution of the Industrial Tribunals and it is for him to judge whether they are judicial or quasi-judicial bodies.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : Is the Hon. Minister aware that even under the provisions of the existing Act, a union is considered to be representative if 25 per cent of the workers are members of it? In view of the fact that over 9,000 out of a total of 22,000 workers are members of these unions what is the criterion by which he considers that these unions are not representatives.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The Government considered that the quantum of bonus had been accepted by a substantial section of labour. When the Government were satisfied about this, they refused to refer the matter for further adjudication. That is how the Government decided not to refer this matter for adjudication.

Houses for lower-income groups

* 125 *Q.*—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether this Government have received any communication from the Centre during June 1956 with regard to the construction of houses for lower-income groups in this State;

(*b*) whether this Government have submitted any report to the Centre in respect of it; and

(*c*) if so, the details thereof?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (*a*) *to* (*c*) Several communications have been received from the Government of India relating to construction of houses under the Low-Income Group